

Remarks

Turning to the Office Action, claims 34, 36, 38, 40, 46, 48, 50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, claims 34-41 and 46-53 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351) in view of Pentikainen (US Publication 2004/0073713) and in further view of Van Der Meulen (US Publication 2002/0129164).

Turning to the appended claims, claims 1-33 and claims 42-45 were previously cancelled. Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 34, 36, 38, 40, 46, 48, 50 and 52 under 35 U. S. C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended claims 34, 38, 46 and 50 to overcome the rejection under 35 U. S. C. §112, first paragraph, and to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, claims 36, 40, 48 and 52 were cancelled from the application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that the previously presented claims are not patentable, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation applications. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U. S. C. §112 rejection with respect to claims 34, 38, 46, and 50 and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the presently amended claims 34, 38, 46, and 50.

Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 34-41 and 46-53 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351) in view of

Pentikainen (US Publication 2004/0073713) and in further view of Van Der Meulen (US Publication 2002/0129164). Applicant has amended claims 34-35, 37-39, 41, 46-47 and 49-51, as discussed herein above. Claims 36, 40, 48 and 52 have been cancelled from the application, as discussed herein above. Furthermore, previously presented claim 53 remains in the application. Turning to the §103(a) rejection, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen, does not teach the present amended claims. Instead, Applicant contends that a combined teaching of Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen would result in a display displaying a list of web sites with additional resource page content including thumbnail images and having a colored vertical bar with a gradation that satisfies the search criteria (Sommerer paragraph [0057]) and where the URLs that have been browsed are displayed in a table form, which displayed table includes a plurality of parameters including title, URL, first visited, last visited and visit count contained in separate fields (Pentikainen paragraph [100]) and with visual indicators associated with a bookmark, where a full gauge indicator indicates a full validity of the first path and where a half-filled gauge indicator indicates that the first path is not valid but a sub-path is valid and where an empty gauge indicator indicates that neither the first path nor the sub-paths are valid (Van Der Meulen paragraph [0049]). Clearly this proposed combination with such a display output does not result in or render obvious the amended independent claims, which include respective displays that “consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on a respective time since last visit by said user and said respective graphic next to a

respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user” and “consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on frequency of visits by said user and said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said frequency of visits to said respective web site by said user”. As such, Applicant contends that the proposed combination of Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen, does not teach the present amended claims and that the rejection of claims 34-35, 37-39, 41, 46-47, 49-51 and 53 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) should be withdrawn and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the presently amended claims 34-35, 37-39, 41, 46-47, 49-51 and 53.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the present claims 34-35, 37-39, 41, 46-47, 49-51 and 53 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and objections and allowance of the present claims 34-35, 37-39, 41, 46-47, 49-51 and 53 in this case are respectfully requested. If these amendments do not result in a Notice of Allowance, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview to accelerate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Silvy Anna Murphy/

Silvy Anna Murphy
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,959
P. O. Box 1254
Cary, North Carolina 27512
Phone: 919-859-2360
Fax: 919-233-9242